

REMARKS

This is in response to the Final Office Action dated December 5, 2008. In the Office Action, claims 1, 3, 4, 6, 7, 14-19, and 21-23 were pending and rejected. With this Amendment, claims 7 and 15 amended; claims 14 and 21-23 are canceled; and new claim 26 is presented.

Section Four of the Office Action indicated that independent claim 7 was objected to due to an alleged informality with respect to “the pronunciation” requiring antecedent basis. Applicants respectfully submit that with the amendment of independent claim 7 that the alleged informality has been remedied. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the objection to independent claim 7, and to claims 14-19 and 21-23 may now be withdrawn.

Section Seven of the Office Action indicated that independent claims 1 and 7, among others, were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Nassiff et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,418,410 – hereinafter “Nassiff”) in view of Hon et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,852,801 – hereinafter “Hon”).

With respect to independent claim 1, Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection set forth in Section Seven of the Office Action. Specifically, Applicants respectfully note that independent claim 1 requires, among other things, selectively increasing a probability associated with an existing pronunciation. The Office Action mischaracterizes independent claim 1 when it concedes, on page 3, that Nassiff does not specifically teach “the selectively increase a probability associated with word.” Note that the claim language requires a pronunciation, not a word as set forth in the Office Action. Moreover, when the Office Action then turns to the teachings of Hon (on page 4) it again is not addressing increasing a probability of a pronunciation. Further still, the text of the Hon reference cited by the Office Action (column 2, lines 30-36) simply provides, “The present invention utilizes language model adaptation to increase the chance to recognize the same word in the future. The present invention increases the unigram probability of an unrecognized word in proportion to the difference of the score of the

unrecognized word and the score of the top one word in order to increase the probability of recognizing that word in the future.” At best, the cited portion of the Hon reference can be thought to increase the unigram probability of an unrecognized word. As set forth in that citation, this is a language model adaptation. There is simply no indication that the Hon reference is increasing a probability associated with an existing pronunciation. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claim 1 is neither taught nor suggested by the Hon reference.

With respect to independent claim 7, Applicants respectfully note that independent claim 7 has been amended to include, among other things, the subject matter previously set forth in dependent claim 14. Accordingly, amended independent claim 7 now recites doing a forced alignment of a wave based on at least one context word. Applicants note that this subject matter was indicated, in Section Eight of the Office Action, as being allegedly met by the combination of Nassiff in view of Hon and further in view of Lewis et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,138,099 – hereinafter “Lewis”). Applicants respectfully note that the Lewis reference merely speaks of comparing the original audio of a dictation to the base form of the replacement text. See column 3, lines 40-42. Lewis does not appear to teach or suggest a forced alignment of a wave, nor doing so based on at least one context word. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that amended independent claim 7 is allowable over the art of record.

With this Amendment, Applicants respectfully submit new claim 26, which is simply a combination of un-amended independent claim 7 in conjunction with canceled dependent claims 21-23. Applicants respectfully note that the subject matter of dependent claims 22 and 23 was indicated, in Section Nine of the Final Office action, as allegedly being unpatentable over Nassiff in view of Hon and further in view of Hoffmann et al. (U.S. Pat. Publ. No. 2003/0139922 – hereinafter “Hoffmann”). Applicants respectfully note that the rejection relies, in part, upon the combination of Nassiff and Hon, and respectfully submit that the hypothetical combination fails to reach the subject matter of independent claim 26, which

provides, "increasing a probability associated with a pronunciation," for the same reasons set forth above with respect to independent claim 1.

In conclusion, Applicants respectfully submit that the entire application is in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and favorable action are respectfully requested.

The Director is authorized to charge any fee deficiency required by this paper or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 23-1123.

Respectfully submitted,

WESTMAN, CHAMPLIN & KELLY, P.A.

By: 

Christopher R. Christenson, Reg. No. 42,413
900 Second Avenue South, Suite 1400
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-3319
Phone: (612) 334-3222 Fax: (612) 334-3312

CRC:lah